

16th November 1922]

[The President]

making a second speech. Under the Standing Order he can make only one speech, but as he has gone so far, I would allow him to proceed on the understanding that he will finish as soon as he can."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"We are quite new, Sir, and I shall be guided by you at every stage."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Let us confine ourselves to this stage now."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"Very well, Sir. So far as the ex officio question is concerned, the hon. the Minister has not replied and the other points he has not objected to. I only wish that at this stage I may be given leave. When the Bill is actually introduced, it may be torn to pieces by the hon. the Minister as he pleases, but if it survives, let it emerge. At present I only ask for leave, Sir, and I should have expected the hon. the Minister not to oppose the granting of the leave to a private member."

The motion was then put to the House and a poll taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai. | 5. Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai. |
| 2. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. | 6. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 3. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu. | 7. " G. Vandanam. |
| 4. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 23. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-Jah Sahib Bahadur. | 24. " V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. |
| 3. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 25. Diwan Bahadur T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai. |
| 4. " the Raja of Panagal. | 26. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai. |
| 5. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro Garu. | 27. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanaunurti Nayudu. |
| 6. " Mr. A. R. Knapp. | 28. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 7. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 29. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 8. " R. G. Grieve. | 30. " S. Mattumanikkachari. |
| 9. " C. W. E. Cotton. | 31. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 10. " E. Periyannayagam. | 32. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 11. " A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. | 33. " A. T. Palmer. |
| 12. " S. R. Y. Ankinodu Prasad Bahadur. | 34. Sri Meka V. Apparao Bahadur. |
| 13. " R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 35. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampam. |
| 14. " B. P. Devarajulu Nayudu. | 36. Rev. W. Meston. |
| 15. Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar. | 37. Hamid Sultan Marakkayar Sahib Bahadur. |
| 16. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | 38. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar. |
| 17. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 39. Kunhammad Koya Sahib Bahadur. |
| 18. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 40. Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razzaq Sahib Bahadur. |
| 19. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 41. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. " W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 42. Mr. M. C. Madurai Pillai. |
| 21. " K. P. Gopala Menon. | 43. " A. M. MacDougall. |
| 22. " B. Muniswami Nayudu. | |

The motion for leave to introduce the Bill was lost: *Ayes* 7 and *Noes* 43.

V

RESOLUTION UNDER SECTION 201 OF THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT.

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—"Mr. President, I beg to move the resolution that stands in my name which reads thus:

That the following draft of the rule proposed to be made by the Local Government under section 201 of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, altering the proviso to rule 5 (2) of Schedule X of that Act, be approved:—

Draft rule.

In exercise of the powers conferred on them by section 201 (1) of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, the Local Government with the approval by

[The Raja of Panagal] [16th November 1922]

resolution of the Legislative Council make the following rule altering the proviso to rule 5 (2) of Schedule X of the said Act:—

"In the proviso to rule 5 (2) of Schedule X of that Act as inserted by notification No. 875 published on page 480 of Part I-A of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 23rd August 1921, for the words 'six months' substitute 'nine months'.

"Sir, according to rule 5 (2) of Schedule X of the Local Boards Act of 1920, all the district boards should have been reconstituted within a year after that Act came into force. That Act came into force on the 1st of April 1921. And all the Boards should have been reconstituted before the 1st of April 1922. But since several of the Boards could not be reconstituted within the limited time, extension was given under the provision of that rule, viz., 5 (2) of Schedule X of the Act of six months. In spite of this extension two of the firkas of the District Board of Nilgiris could not complete their elections and the President of the district board brought the fact to the notice of the Government in September of this year. The President was informed that until all the elections have taken place the reconstitution of the Board could not be considered complete. We cannot extend the time without a resolution being passed by this Council. In these circumstances, Sir, I move the resolution and I trust that the Council will pass it."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—"I second it."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, before we can be called upon to vote on this motion, I wish to know fully the circumstances under which it could not be effected within the period once allowed and why it should become necessary to ask for further extension. After the constitution of the local boards under the new Acts both in the case of municipalities and local boards, apart from the delay in the preparation of the electoral rolls and the consequent extension of time asked for, it has come to my notice that in various cases there have been extensions of time to reconstitute the bodies owing to various causes which the public are not in a position to appreciate. It is, therefore, necessary that before we are called upon to give our assent to a resolution of this general description, we must be satisfied that really necessary reasons led to the postponement of the reconstitution of the local boards in question."

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—"Sir, the District Board of Nilgiris is one where there is direct election of members. It was necessary to prepare the electoral rolls and hence the delay. Besides, Sir, there have been several cases of technical objections and these necessarily caused delay in reconstituting the boards."

The resolution was then put and carried.

The House then adjourned at 4-15 p.m. to meet at 11 a.m. on Friday, the 17th November 1922.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.